

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

CURTIS HUNTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

RIVERBEND CORRECTIONAL  
FACILITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:19-cv-491 (MTT)

**ORDER**

Pro se Plaintiff Curtis Hunter, who is proceeding *in forma pauperis*, moves for reconsideration of the Court's order (Doc. 103) denying his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal. Doc. 104. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, "Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice." M.D. Ga. L.R. 7.6. Indeed, "[r]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly." *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at \*1 (M.D. Ga. Jan. 21, 2010) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It "is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law." *Id.* "In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate his prior arguments, and any arguments which the party

inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived.” *McCoy v. Macon Water Authority*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

Hunter’s motion merely contends he does not need further authorization from the Court to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal. Doc. 104. But as the Court previously explained, Hunter is required to make a showing that his appeal is taken in good faith. Doc. 101. Because Hunter has not satisfied the good faith requirement, the Court denied Hunter’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal. Doc. 103 at 3. Hunter’s motion for reconsideration (Doc. 104) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 16th day of June, 2022.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, CHIEF JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT